

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/673,455	Applicant(s) NISHIDA ET AL.	
	Examiner Thinh H. Nguyen	Art Unit 2861	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thinh H. Nguyen. (3) _____

(2) Nataliya Dvorson. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 13 December 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-21.

Identification of prior art discussed: cited prior art.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner maintained that the rejection is being proper and objection to the claimed limitation remained allowable upon which amendment with the based claims being incorporated these limitations.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Thinh Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2800

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required